

REMARKS

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chang et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,909,392). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chang et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,909,392) in view of *Chung* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0185619 A1). Claims 1, 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hsu et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,598,752 B1) in view of *Chung* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0185619 A1). Claims 1-4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Haddad et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,172,909 B1) in view of *Chung* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0185619 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Chang et al., *Chung*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Haddad et al.* do not teach or suggest the subject matter of the amended claims of the present invention. Short channel (< 0.2 micron) NROM devices present specific erase problems that are solved by the claimed voltage ranges and/or ramped control gate voltages of the present invention as used in NROM devices having channels less than 0.2 micron. Even if it were obvious to combine these references, and Applicants maintain that it is not, the combination still would not anticipate the present invention as claimed in the amended claims.

Examiner Telephone Interview Summary

After a telephone interview with the Examiner on 2/6/06, it was agreed that by including the subject matter of claims 5 and 6 into claim 1, the Examiner would allow claims 1, 3, 4, and 7. The Examiner also stated that previously withdrawn Claims 8 – 14 could be allowable if similar subject matter were added to claim 8. Applicants have added the limitation from claim 10 regarding the constant voltage range applied to the first source/drain region. Claim 10 has been amended to delete this subject matter to avoid duplication.

The Examiner also stated that due to the claimed subject matter of the current application and a related divisional application (Application No. 11/099,839), a terminal disclaimer would be necessary. The Examiner stated that he would do an Examiner's amendment on the '839 application to incorporate the short channel length of less than 0.2 micron into the independent claims, thus making the claims of the '839 application allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2211. No new matter has been added and no additional fee is required by this amendment and response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

2/8/06

Kenneth W. Bolvin

Kenneth W. Bolvin

Reg. No. 34,125

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
T (612) 312-2200
F (612) 312-2250